UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,651	03/29/2001	Takao Yoshimine	275747US6	5730

22850 7590 07/13/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
CHANKONG, DOHM	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/821,651	YOSHIMINE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dohm Chankong	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 May 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-6,9-11,14-16 and 19-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 4-6, 9-11, 14-16 and 19-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1> This action is in response to Applicant's request for continued examination, filed 5.2.06. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are amended. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 14-16 and 19-21 are presented for further examination.

2> This is a non-final rejection.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3> A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5.2.06 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

I. Response to Arguments

Applicant argues in substance: (A) Prust discloses manually connecting to a storage area; (B) the prior art references do no teach an address defined, in part, by user registration data; and (C) the prior art references do not teach performing connection procession automatically via actuation of a corresponding upload icon. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Automating a known process does not by itself impart nonobviousness

Applicant asserts that access of a storage area is done manually in the Prust reference. Applicant's remarks, pg. 8, ¶4. It should be noted that merely using a computer to automate a known process does not by itself impart nonobviousness to the invention. MPEP §2106(VI). Thus, even if Applicant's assertion is accurate, simply automating a manual process does not impart nonobviousness to Applicant's invention.

In any case, Prust specifically discloses that files may automatically be transferred to a user's exclusive storage location [column 6 «lines 33-36»]. While not expressly stated, the feature of automatically connection to an access point is implied by Prust's disclosure. Prust's feature of automatic uploading files implies that the program must also automatically connect to the exclusive storage location. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the feature of automatic connection processing is implied in Prust.

B. Prust and Applicant's admitted prior art teach an address defined, in part, by user registration data

Applicant next argues that Prust and Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) fail to teach an address defined, in part, by the user registration data. Applicant asserts that the references do not teach "including registration data in a URL address". Applicant's remarks, pg. 9, ¶2. However, the claims state, in part, "address data defined, in part, by the user registration data". An address data defined by user registration data does not necessarily mean that the address data includes the user's registration data.

Also, the full disclosure of AAPA is: "To assign the exclusive storage area in the server to each user, a uniform resource locator (URL) related to a user ID is issued...". Applicant's specification, pg. 2, ¶2. That is, the sole purpose of issuing the URL related to the user ID is to assign an exclusive storage area specifically for the user. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably infer that the URL would be defined by a unique user ID in order to obtain an exclusive storage area for that particular user, and only that user.

To support this analysis, Prust discloses in his specification utilizing this exact same teaching. Applicant argues that an email address is not an access point. However, as set forth by Applicant's specification, an access point is merely "address data...indicating his/her exclusive storage area". Applicant's specification, pg. 3, ¶1. Prust discloses an email address that is capable of achieving this purpose of indicating the user's exclusive storage area [column 7 «lines 9-14»]. Prust discloses that the email address is defined, in part, by user information [column 7 «lines 7-14»].

C. Prust and Burson disclose performing connection processing via actuation of a corresponding upload icon

Applicant also has amended the independent claims to now state that the connection processing is performed automatically via actuation of a corresponding upload icon. This functionality is widely known in the art and does not provide any patentable distinction over the prior art. For example, by simply clicking on an Internet Explorer icon, Internet Explorer will automatically perform connection processing automatically to a predefined access point, otherwise known as a user's home page.

Additionally, Burson expressly discloses "[u]pon activation of the link, the client computer is automatically driven to the personal information provider presenting to the user via the client computer a page on the personal information provider" [abstract]. Burson's link is analogous to Applicant's claimed icon. Burson clearly discloses that upon actuation of the link, connection processing is performed to automatically connect to a user's access point. Indeed, Burson specifically teaches:

"The delivery component may deliver not only the PI but also an access point directly to the provider's page supplying that PI. The access point may take the form of a link, a form button or some other interactive access mechanism." (emphasis added) [column 14 «lines 45-48»].

An icon is much like a link and form button in that it is a well known interactive access mechanism.Thus, Prust and Burson disclose performing connection processing via actuation of a corresponding upload icon.

D. Conclusion

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but for the foregoing reasons, are not found persuasive. The rejections set forth in the previous Office action, filed 3.2.2006, are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art

> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4> Claims 1, 5-6, 10-11, 15-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prust, U.S Patent No. 6.714.968 in view of Burson et al, U.S Patent No. 6.405.245 ["Burson"], in further view of Cohen, U.S Patent No. 6.356.941, in further view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ["AAPA"].

5> The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6> As to claim 1, Prust discloses an information processing device, comprising:

transmitting means for transmitting user registration data necessary to secure a user's exclusive storage area in a server connected in a network, to said server over a network [abstract | Figure 8 «items 805, 807» | column 7 «line 59» to column 8 «line 7»];

receiving means for receiving address data designated as an access point indicating said exclusive storage area oriented to said user registration data from said server over said network [column 5 «lines 29-38» | column 6 «lines 23-36 and 59-62» where: Prust discloses using a web browser to access the storage area. Therefore it is implicit that an address is transmitted from which the user can access the area]; and

wherein each of said automatic upload programs is programmed to connect to a unique part of said exclusive storage area [Figure 5 | column 6 «lines 28-35» where : Prust';

connection means for performing connection processing automatically to said access point in the said server based on said address data received by said receiving means [column

6 «lines 23-36» where: Prust discloses automatically connecting to the remote directory using a script].

transfer means for writing a data file to the exclusive storage area automatically when connection processing is performed [Figure 5 where : the script automatically writes information the specified storage area when connected to the storage area].

Prust discloses utilizing scripts (upload programs) to connect to remote storage but does not disclose:

that the address data is defined, in part, by the user registration data;

receiving the one or more automatic upload programs;

performing connection processing automatically via actuation of a corresponding upload icon; and

transferring a control file used for controlling access by another user.

7> Applicant submits as prior art that it is well known, when assigning an exclusive storage area in the server to a user, that a universal resource locator (URL) related to the user ID, is issued. Applicant's specification, pg. 2, ¶ 2. Prust implicitly suggests such functionality as well [Figures 6 & 7]. Prust discloses that the user is assigned storage area with addresses having the same name as the user ID [the name "Prust" defines the storage directory in Figure 6, and defines the email address in Figure 7].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the combination of Prust and the AAPA disclose that the address data is defined, in part, by the user registration data (such as a user ID). One would have been motivated to provide the

user with the ability to easily access and transfer data to his storage information [see Prust column 7 «lines 7-34»].

8> In the same field of invention, Burson discloses a system for accessing personal data. One of the methods that Burson achieves this functionality is by having the client download an application to the client; the application is then responsible for automated data communications between the client and the server [Figure 2 | column 3 «lines 15-29» | column 15 «lines 1-45» where : the receiving means is implied and inherent in Burson's client computer and software. The computer is connected to the Internet and downloads the necessary automatic upload program; therefore, the client must be equipped with a receiving means that downloads the program].

Performing connection processing automatically via actuation of a corresponding upload icon is a well known feature in the art. Burson also discloses this feature [abstract | column 14 «lines 45-48»]. Burson discloses that the link or other interactive mechanism is advantageous because it provides a user a quicker mechanism for accessing his access point [column 14 «lines 49-54»].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Burson's downloading functionality into Prust's system, modifying Prust's scripts so they are downloaded from the server as taught by Burson. One would have been particularly motivated to perform such an implementation to enable Prust's scripts to be platform independent (JAVA applet, as is well known in the art) and would further enhance Prust's stated objective of providing a variety of remote access possibilities to the storage site. It is

further advantageous to provide automated actions for logging on and accessing access points within a remote storage server as is taught in Burson.

9> In the same field of invention, Cohen is directed towards establishing personal network vaults for users that enable secure remote storage of files. A distinguishing function proposed in Cohen is that users have control over who can access their personal vault [column 7 «lines 60-65» | column 11 «lines 26-29»]. This is achieved in part through the use of an authorization list, that permits only authorized users access to a particular file within the vault. Therefore, Cohen teaches transferring a control file used for controlling access by another user to the data file [column 4 «lines 55-59» | column 9 «lines 2-7 and 20-22» | column 15 «line 61» to column 16 «line 3» | column 16 «lines 15-20» where : Cohen discloses a client-side user interface that enables the user to perform administrative actions, such as using the access list for controlling who as access to his vault and transferring files to the server]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Cohen's authorization list functionality into Prust's remote user storage system for the obvious advantages of enabling security features and allowing a user to control which other users have access to their files.

10> As to claim 5, Prust discloses an information processing device of claim 1 wherein said address data is a uniform resource locator (URL) for designating resources on said network [column 5 «lines 29-38» | column 6 «lines 23-36 and 59-62» | column 7 «lines 26-30»].

11> As to claims 6, 11 and 16, as they are merely methods or mediums that perform the same steps of the device of claim 1, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth for claim 1, supra.

12> As to claims 10, 15 and 20, as they are merely methods or mediums that perform the same steps of the device of claim 5, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth for claim 5, supra.

13> Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being anticipated by Prust, Burson, Cohen and AAPA, in further view of Hayes, Jr. et al ("Hayes"), U.S Patent No. 6,339,826.

14> As to claim 4, Prust and Burson disclose the information processing device wherein said connection means is to perform connection processing to said access point in said server in response to a click operation on an exclusive icon which is displayed on a given display unit [see Prust, column 5 «lines 29-38 and 45-59»] but do not explicitly disclose that the icon drives an automatic upload program.

15> Hayes teaches an icon that drives an automatic connection setting program [Figure 7, items 710 712, 714, and 716 | column 14 «lines 7-26 and 50-65]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hayes' icon functionality into Prust and Burson increase the security of the device by associating specific

icons (and their related applications) to users, which would consequently allow users to access only those applications on the server which they are authorized. Additionally, the use of icons with applet programs such as those seen in Burson and Hayes is well known in the art.

16> Claim 9 is a method that claims the steps carried out by the information processing device of claim 4. Therefore, claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth for claim 4, supra.

17> Claim 14 is a storage medium that claims the steps performed by the information processing device of claim 4. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth for claim 4, supra.

18> Claim 19 is a network system consisting of a server and information processing device connected to said server that performs the steps of the information processing device of claim 4. Therefore, claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth for claim 4, supra.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is 571.272.3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday [7:30 AM to 4:30 PM].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571.272.3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DC

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER